

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Final Office Action dated June 30, 2005, claims 1-3/ stand pending in the application. Claims 1 and 22 have been cancelled. The allowability of claim 17 is acknowledged. Claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner for reconsideration of the claims.

Claims 1-16, and 18-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Takagi* (6,324,458).

Applicant respectfully traverses with respect to the various claims described below. Claim 7 recites applying an increased drive torque to a second wheel relative to a first wheel when applying brake-steer. The Examiner points to the *Takagi* reference as disclosing that the engine and subsequently the drive torque is controlled. Applicant agrees that a reduction in drive torque is taught in Col. 9, lines 49-60. However, no teaching or suggestion is found for increasing a drive torque to a second wheel relative to a first wheel. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claims 14 and 25.

With respect to claim 8, claim 8 recites applying brake-steer by applying brakes and increasing normal load on at least one wheel by modifying a suspension component. This claim has been amended from its original version by reciting that the normal load is increased by modifying a suspension component. Applicant respectfully submits that no teaching or suggestion is set forth for applying brakes and increasing normal load on at least one wheel by modifying a suspension component. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well. Likewise, claim 15 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons.


With respect to claim 20, claim 20 recites determining a steering wheel torque and applying brake-steer in response to steering wheel torque. The Examiner points to Col. 8, lines

36-37, for this teaching. Applicant has reviewed this section and can find no teaching or suggestion of steering wheel torque. In fact, the steering wheel angle and steering system gear ratio is set forth but no steering wheel torque is determined and therefore no modifying brake-steer in response to the steering wheel torque is also set forth. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of claim 20.

Likewise, claim 28 is also believed to be allowable for the same reason set forth above since it also recites determining the steering wheel torque. Applicant therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of these claims as well.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all rejections are now overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 8-30-2005